UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,446	03/16/2004	Jeffery Carter	01597/1	1995

7590 09/15/2006

Pfizner, Inc
5th Floor
575 Maryville Center Drive
St Louis, MO 63141

EXAMINER	
BALLS, ROBERT J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1625	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/801,446	CARTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	R. James Balls	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 November 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are pending.

2. This application claims benefit of Provisional Application No. 60/459,214 filed on March 31, 2003.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 2-8 & 10-11, drawn to compounds with a chromene core wherein R^1 and R^2 do not form a ring (and linking claims 1, 9 and 12-27 that read on Claims 2-8 &10-11), classified in class 549, subclass 398. An election of a single disclosed species is also required.

II. Claims 9 and 12, drawn to compounds with a quinoline core wherein R^1 and R^2 do not form a ring (and linking claims 1 and 13-27 that read on quinoline derivatives), classified in class 546, subclass 168. An election of a single disclosed species is also required.

III. Claims 1 and 13-27, drawn to compounds with a thiochromene core wherein R^1 and R^2 do not form a ring, classified in class 549, subclass 23. An election of a single disclosed species is also required.

IV. Claims 1-8 and 13-27 (not included in groups I-III, i.e. where R^1 and R^2 do form a ring) classified in various classes and subclasses depending on the species. This group may be subject to further restriction according to elected core structure. Also, an election of a single disclosed species is required.

V. Claim 29 drawn to a method of treating a COX-2 mediated inflammatory disorders, classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes, 312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disclosed species is also required.

VI. Claim 30 drawn to a method of treating a COX-2 mediated neoplasia, classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes, 312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disclosed species for use in this method is also required.

VII. Claim 31 drawn to a method of treating a COX-2 mediated ophthalmic disorders, classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes,

312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disclosed species for use in this method is also required.

VIII. Claim 32 drawn to a method of treating COX-2 mediated cardiovascular disorders, classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes, 312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disclosed species for use in this method is also required.

IX. Claim 33 drawn to a method of treating COX-2 mediated schizophrenia, classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes, 312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disclosed species for use in this method is also required.

X. Claim 28 drawn to a method of treating COX-2 mediated disorders not encompassed by Groups IV-IX classified in class 514, various subclass 456 for chromenes, 312 for quinolines, and 432 for thiochromenes. An election of a single disorder and a single disclosed species for use in this method is also required.

Claims 1,9 & 12-27 link(s) inventions I-IV. Claim 28 links inventions IV-VIII. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claim 1,9 & 12-28. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. **Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-IV are directed to COX-II inhibitors. The inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants of one another. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, Inventions I-III have independent and distinct structures, which lack a substantial structural feature recognized in the art as being essential to the disclosed utility (see the groups different classification). A reference that anticipates any one of groups I-III would not render the other groups obvious. A search for one group is not coextensive with a search of any other group and it would be a tremendous burden to search all the groups without restriction. Should applicants traverse on the ground that the compounds are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now or record showing compounds of groups I-IV are obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in an obviousness rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

Inventions V-X are directed to methods of treating diseases with COX-II inhibitors. Each invention is drawn to an independent and distinct disease. Inventions

are unrelated if it can be shown that they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different diseases claimed include inflammatory disorders, neoplasia, ophthalmic disorders, cardiovascular disorders, and schizophrenia. Each class of disease is unique in that it involved a different physiological process and there is no known single compound capable of treating every class of disease claimed. Furthermore, a reference that anticipates any one of groups V-X would not render the other groups obvious. A search for one group is not coextensive with a search of any other group and it would be a tremendous burden to search all the groups without restriction. Should applicants traverse on the ground that the compounds are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now or record showing compounds of groups V-X are obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in an obviousness rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

Inventions I-IV are related to Inventions V-X as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the process can be practiced with a materially different product. For example, Celebrex® is a COX-II inhibitor useable in the treatment of arthritis (see www.celebrex.com).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are

subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is *presented prior to* final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai; In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. §103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. *Applicants are reminded of propriety of process of use claims in consideration of the "reach-through" format, which is drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality. Reach-through claims are considered lacking of descriptive and enabling support from the specification. Thus, rejoinable process of use claims are those with particular disease named with efficacy support from the specification for treating the particular disease.* **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. James Balls whose telephone number is (571) 272-7997. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00am - 4:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom McKenzie can be reached on (571) 272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

R. James Balls
September 11, 2006

Celia Chang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625